

PARTMENT OF COMMERCE **Patent and Trademark Office**

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

08/803,814

02/24/97

SIITONEN

466-006903-U

LM02/0730

HARRY F SMITH PERMAN & GREEN 425 POST ROAD FAIRFIELD CT 06430 **EXAMINER**

L

JUNG, D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2771

DATE MAILED:

07/30/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks



Advisory Action

Application No.

08/803,814

Applicant

Siitonen et al.

Examiner

David Jung

Group Art Unit 2771



TH	E PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]
	a) expires months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
	b) Expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.
	Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.
	Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).
	plicant's response to the final rejection, filed on <u>Jul 15, 1999</u> has been considered with the following effect, t is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:
X	The proposed amendment(s):
	will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.
	🛛 will not be entered because:
	X they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).
	they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).
	they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
	they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
	NOTE: the remarks section of the amendment argued that the proposed amendments merely clarify, but the
	remarks section further argued that the claims would be allowable because of proposed amendments.
	Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):
	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.
	The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
	The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
X	For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):
	Claims allowed: none
	Claims objected to: none
	Claims rejected: 1-28
	The proposed drawing correction filed on hashas not been approved by the Examiner.
	Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s).
X	Other Arguments by atty did not address why the selection taught by Abdul-Halim and Hashimoto et al. cannot be combined with the multiple directories taught by the Manual - thereby teaching the selection of one of the multiple directories. This and other issues rasied in the rejections need to be addressed. THOMAS G. BLACK THOMAS G. BLACK THOMAS G. BLACK SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINATION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PR